DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 992 HE 023 099

AUTHOR Leslie, Larry L.; And Others
TITLE Progress Report on the National Donor Data Base Project. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
SPONS AGENCY Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Washington, D.C.; Indiana Univ.-Purdue Univ., Indianapolis. Center for Philanthropy.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Atlanta, GA, November 2-5, 1989). Tables at the end of the document may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alumni; *Database Design; Databases; *Donors; Educational Finance; Financial Support; *Fund Raising; Higher Education; Information Sources; National Surveys; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; National Donor Data Base Project

ABSTRACT

A progress report on the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CASE) National Donor Data Base Project is presented. The project, which began in June 1987, has proceeded in several phases: (1) data base design; (2) acquisition of data from participating institutions; (3) development of software to load each institution's data into the donor data base; (4) development of a questionnaire to capture data items not available in the data files; and (5) production of preliminary results from the aggregate of all institutions in the file. The CASE Donor Data Base is valuable for many useful research studies because: it is the only extant source of donor data with a nationwide scope; data are available for all large donors at many institutions; a study of the giving behavior of donors/alumni in the institution's home state can be compared with that of similar individuals residing in surrounding states or states more remote than surrounding ones; and it is possible to compare the magnitude of giving for individuals receiving the bachelor's degree with those receiving professional or other advanced degrees. Seven appendices provide information on: variables in institutional files; software vendors sending materials in response to the letter of inquiry; institutions expressing an interest in CASE donor data base project but not participating; on missing data percentages for key variables, institutions A-E; percentage of records containing valid values for combinations of variables; and data base preliminary results. The survey form itself is also appended. (SM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED313992

# Progress Report on the National Donor Data Base Project

Larry L. Leslie
Kenneth G. Brown
Judy Diane Grace
Jeffrey G. Rapp

Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ASHE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

November 1989

This project was supported by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) and The Center for Philanthropy, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, Indiana. The authors assume full responsibility for the statements herein.

HE 023 099

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Ritz-Carlton, Buckhead in Atlanta, Georgia, November 2-5, 1989. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

## Introduction

The Center for the Study of Higher Education's first involvement with the CASE Research Committee was in the spring and summer of 1986. At that time the Center, with a great deal of input from Dr. William Pickett, then chairman of the CASE Research Committee, developed a proposal for a research project. Two separate but interrelated tasks were proposed for this initial phase of the CASE research program. The first of these was to involve the pilot testing of a survey instrument to collect basic data on fund raising activities; a revised version of this instrument, based on pilot study findings, was to be used to collect data from a carefully selected panel of institutions. Task two was to involve the creation and analysis of a donor data base. Due to a lack of fiscal resources and concern about piloting an instrument, this initial proposal was not funded by the CASE Research Committee.

In June, 1987, a Center proposal to perform a pilot study regarding development of a donor data base was funded by CASE. Subsequent, supplementary funding for continuation of this project was received from the Indiana University-Purdue University, Center for Philanthropy in June, 1988.

The CASE Donor Data Base project has proceeded in several, sometimes overlapping, phases. Phase one, the data base design phase, included selection of the variables for inclusion in the data base and design of a sampling methodology. Phase two

included acquisition of data from those institutions agreeing to participate in the project. Phase three included the development of software to load each participating institution's data into the donor data base. Phase four included the development of a questionnaire designed to capture data items that were not available in the data files of the participating institutions or had a high percentage of missing values on these files. Note that this phase was not a part of the proposal submitted in June, 1987. The final phase included the production of preliminary results from the aggregate of all institutions in the file. Each of these phases will be discussed in the sections that follow.

**Background**

Major studies about fund raising are generally categorized into four areas: surveys of trends in levels and sources of funding; economic studies related to policy; studies of costs; and studies of giving behavior, especially related to demographic and psychological variables (Jacobson, in press).

The Donor Data Base project falls into this last area.

Recently, these studies have been aided by sophisticated databases and complex computer programs. The most visible and arguably viable approach is donor profiling. Profiling, a concept borrowed directly from marketing research, involves describing groups of potential donors by their common characteristics, e.g., income, undergraduate activities, number of children attending alma mater, etc. The end result is a description of a market segment which can be expected to contribute to the college or

university at an expected level (Pray 1981). Such profiles are often used in planning major campaigns and, of course, in targeting annual and special fund solicitation.

Most studies of giving behavior are institutional specific (University of Michigan), or focus on a particular type of institution (liberal arts institutions as in Pickett's work). The Donor Data Base was conceived as a way to identify variables associated with giving on a cross sector and cross institutional type basis, to open up new streams of inquiry about what makes people philanthrophically inclined toward their alma mater.

The conceptual framework for the study was drawn from the sociological literature, particularly that on reciprocity (Gouldner 1960). Extended to donor behavior vis-a-vis colleges and universities, researchers and practitioners have used sociological and anthropological descriptions (Kraus 1988; Higley 1980; Burnett 1974; Spaeth and Greeley 1970). The theory of reciprocity in this context Payton 1988) suggests that unique conditions or variables in the collegiate environment may influence future alumni giving patterns. Because this behavior can be predicted, fiscal support from alums can be planned for, and, moreover, the environment can be manipulated to influence conditions conducive to giving. A well known example of this, although not generally regarded as provable, is the premise that students who belong to Greek organizations during their undergraduate years are more loyal to the institution and therefore give more as alumni donors. Other researchers have

found that simply communicating a need to alumni about institutional need is sufficient to motivate donors (Leslie, 1986).

Regardless of the literature, it is folk wisdom that something happens during the collegiate experience that does condition alumni toward giving or not giving. And regardless of the variables identified, be they as specific as successful football teams, or as general as what Grace has called "the Boys' Town syndrome," something does happen to influence alumni attitudes toward their alma maters. Identifying those conditions favorable to alumni support has been the focus of much of this strain of literature.

**Data Base Design and Sampling Scheme**

Because the CASE Donor Data Base was to be compiled from data extracted from institutional files, it was necessary to determine the types of variables available in a typical institution's donor data base. It was determined that the best way to do this was to examine donor data file descriptions, and all members of the CASE Research Committee were asked to supply descriptions for their institution's files. Donor data file descriptions were received from six institutions: Northern Illinois University, Texas Christian University, Tufts University, University of Arizona, University of Miami, and University of San Diego. Based on the common variables available in the donor data files of these institutions, a list of

variables was compiled for possible inclusion in the CASE Donor Data Base. The variables on this list were supplemented by several variables which, while not common among all institutions, were felt to be necessary additions in order for the file to provide as rich a source of variables as possible for the donor research community. This original list, produced in August of 1987, contained approximately 160 variables; subsequent experience with the actual institutional data files and coding schemes has reduced the number of variables on this list to 137. The most recent version of this list is in Appendix A.

Concurrent with the data base design phase, an investigation of commercially available development data systems was performed. It was felt that one of these systems might provide an efficient and effective alternative to the Center's development of the software necessary to map various institution's data into the CASE Donor Data Base. A list of software vendor names and addresses was compiled from an article in CASE Currents and from other individuals having experience in this area. A letter, which explained the purpose of the research project and requested information on the systems, was sent to each vendor on the list. A careful examination of the materials received from these vendors indicated that none was suitable for use in the project. A list of the vendors responding to the letter appears in Appendix B.

A stratified random sampling of individuals was developed for use in the project; i.e., no corporate, business, foundation

or other entity were in the sampling frame. The sampling frame was divided into three strata: 1) Large Donors--those donating $25,000 or more in one year over the past five years, (2) Other Donors--those donors not in category 1, (3) Non-donors--non-donors in the institution's donor data file. A random sample of 500 individuals was to be selected from each of these categories from the data files of each institution participating in the project. Samples of size 500 have been realized for categories 2 and 3 but not for category 1. In this latter category, we have usually taken all individuals meeting the criterion; the number of individuals in this category has ranged from 0 to 131 for the seven institutions processed thus far.

After the list of variables had been developed from the various institutions' donor data file descriptions, this list along with other project materials were reviewed by two economists and a sociologist. In general, these reviewers thought the variables on the list were those necessary to accomplish the project's goals; however, each made suggestions for additions that would make the donor data base a much richer resource for researchers in this area.

**Data Acquisition and Software Development**

Software development began in December, 1987, with the construction of a COBOL file description based on the list of variables selected earlier. A list of codes for categorical

variables in the data base was the next item developed and these codes were related to the COBOL file description through the variable name by means of a COBOL construct that expedites decision making by association of specific values of variables with variable names in the data base. Codes were developed for titles, gender, ethnicity, athletic participation, fraternities/sororities, position titles and a large number of other categorical variables in the data base. In addition to specific codes for categorical variables, several generic codes were adopted for use in identifying special conditions that may apply to a variable. For example, in the CASE data base if a variable does not exist on the institutional file supplied, that variable's field in the CASE data base will be filled with 8s for that institution.

Following development of the file description and variable codes, work began on program code to map the sample data received from Institution A (IA) into the data base. Only the demographic data for the sampled individuals were received on tape supplied by this institution, the "giving" data for each donor was on a hard copy listing. A separate data entry program had to be developed to enter the giving data into a file which was subsequently merged with the demographic data using the identification number as a key. The sample originally received from IA did not contain non-donors; IA subsequently supplied data on non-donors. However, this file had a format different from that of the donor file supplied earlier and required some changes

to the original program in order to load these data into the donor data base.

All the data received from Institution B (IB) were in hard copy form. At the time of the request for data from IB, they had lost their programmer and could only produce alphabetic listings of their files. A sampling scheme based on alphabetical order was developed by the Center and a sample based on this scheme was produced by IB personnel. A program was written to allow these data to be entered into a data base management system and to be printed out for verification. After verification these data were uploaded to a file on a mainframe computer and a program was written to map data elements from the file to the donor data base.

Data originally received from Institution C did not contain a number of variables indicated by the file description as being in the university's donor file. These variables were critical to research purposes of the donor data base. In correspondence between the development data processing personnel and Center staff, agreement was reached as to the data elements that would be supplied for use in the donor data base project. These data items were subsequently supplied to the Center for every 100th non-donor and all regular donors. A sample of size 500 was drawn from the regular donor file and data on these individuals, along with the data on the 1,102 non-donors, were added to the donor data base. Note that no data were received on large donors; data on these individuals were not maintained in machine readable form

and, thus, were not available for inclusion in the donor data base.

A preliminary examination of the data file supplied by Institution D determined that the data file description did not match the file on the tape. Correspondence with the personnel who supplied the data confirmed this conclusion and the correct file description was sent. Even after the correct file description was implemented, some questions arose regarding the meaning of some of the giving fields on the file; these were cleared up through a phone contact. Data for this institution have been added to the data base.

Institution E's development data processing operation supplied the Center with the identification numbers of individuals on their file in each of the three groups, i.e., large donors, regular donors, and non-donors. Since these were a relatively small number of large donors (131) the decision was made to include all of these individuals in the data base; samples of the identification number were drawn for each of the other two groups and these sample identification numbers were returned to the institution. Subsequently, data on each of the individuals in the samples were supplied to the Center on a set of floppy diskettes. These data have been added to the donor data base.

A sampling procedure similar to the one used for Institution E was used for Institution H; i.e., the institution supplied the Center with identification numbers of individuals in the three

donor categories and the Center sampled these and returned the sample identification numbers to the institution. Data on the sampled individuals have not yet been received.

In contrast to the procedure used for Institutions E and H, Institution F (IF) supplied the Center with data for all individuals in their donor file. The Center identified the members of each of the three groups and drew the samples of the regular donors and non-donors; only two large donors were in the file supplied. Data on the sampled individuals have been added to the CASE donor data base. Note that this institution did not supply the zip codes of individuals, thus limiting the use of these data for regional studies.

Data have also been received from another university, Institution G. As was the case with Institution F, Institution G supplied data on all individuals in their file. A procedure similar to that used for IF was used to sample and load these data on the CASE donor data base.

Over the course of the project a number of institutions had agreed to supply data from their development files for use in the donor data base. For one reason or another these institutions were not able to honor their commitment. A list of these institutions appears in Appendix C.

**Missing Values**

One of the most vexing problems with any research data base

is the problem of missing data. There are two aspects of this problem that manifest themselves in the CASE donor data base. The first of these is that a variable of interest was not collected by a given institution or simply was not among the variables in the file supplied to the Center. In the second, the variable exists in the file but values are missing for that variable in a number of individual records. Of the two, the latter problem is the most troublesome because of its impact on various types of analyses planned, e.g., regression, cross-tabulation, etc.

In order to assess the missing value problem, several key variables were analyzed for four of the institutions. These variables were zip code, gender, ethnicity, date of birth, marital status, position title code, salary code, indication of deferred giving, most recent degree type, year of most recent degree, and major field of most recent degree. The availability of each of these variables in four of the institutional files processed as well as the percentage of missing values for each of these variables are shown in Appendix D.

All of the institutions have zip codes and the percentage of missing values for this variable is low. This result is not surprising since most development office communication is done through the mail and a zip code is obviously required on any materials sent through the mail. Gender was not supplied by IB (the loss of their data processing person at the time the data were supplied undoubtedly prevented this inclusion) but was

supplied by each of the other three institutions tested in this regard; percentage of missing values for this variable were generally low and ranged from 0% to 15% except for the large donor file for IE which had 44% missing values. Ethnicity was available for only one of the institutions and had a 95% missing value rate for each of the files from this institution. Date of birth was not supplied by IB and was supplied only for non-donors by IA; in general the percentages of missing values were high for IE and IA non-donors, and were relatively low for the IC at 9% for donors and 11% for non-donors. The availability and missing values for the marital status variable mirrored those of date of birth. Only one institution, IA, did not have a position title code variable among those supplied for the CASE data base; however, the percentages of missing values for the other institutions were relatively high, ranging from 21% to 79%. Only one institution, IC, indicated the salary level of the individual; missing value percentages for this variable were 75% for regular donors and 94% for non-donors, both of which are high enough to make this variable virtually of no use for analytical purposes. None of the institutions supplied any variable indicating deferred giving. Information regarding the most recent degree awarded and the year in which it was awarded have highly variable missing values percentages, ranging from 9% to 75%. The variable, major field of study, usually has higher percentages of missing values than do the type of degree or degree date.

Perhaps of more importance to analysis, especially multivariate analysis, is the percentage of records in a given sample file that have valid values for a set of core variables. If the percentage is low, the use of that sample in an analysis is constrained. In order to measure this aspect of the data base, an incremental approach was utilized. In this approach a number of variables were selected as the core variables and the percentage of records containing valid values for all core variables, simultaneously, was calculated. Variables with the lowest percentages of missing values in each institutional subfile were usually selected to form this set of core variables. After calculating the percentage for the core variables, other variables were added to the list and the analysis was repeated using this augmented list. As will be shown in the discussions below, the number of core variables used in each institutional analysis was small and the percentages fall sharply when other variables were added. Appendix E contains the results of all analyses attempted.

Since IB University supplied data only for regular donors, this was the only subfile that could be analyzed for this institution. Core variables in this analysis included zip code, most recent degree year, and position title code. Approximately 60% of the records in this file contained valid values for all three of these variables. No other variables, except major field of study for most recent degree (62% missing values), were available for testing for this institution.

All three subfiles were supplied by IA but the variable list

for non-donors contained some variables not available in the two donor files for this institution. Zip code, gender and most recent degree year were the variables tested for completeness in the regular- and large-donor files; the percentages of records containing valid values for all three of these variables were approximately 66% and 55%, respectively, in these two files. For the non-donors, date of birth and marital status were added to the three core variables; only 24% of the records in this file contained valid values for all five of these variables.

Institution E's regular donor file had 72% of the records with valid values for the variable combination of zip code, gender, position title code, and most recent degree year. When marital status was added to this core variable list, the completeness percentage dropped to 6%. Using the same core variables on the large donor file produced a completeness rate of 25%; adding marital status to the core variables for this file produced a 20% completeness rate. Testing only the core variables in the non-donor file yielded a 59% completeness rate.

Core variables used in the Institution C tests for completeness were zip code, gender, date of birth, marital status and most recent degree year. This combination produced a completeness rate of 84% for the regular donors and 77% for the non-donors. Adding the variable position title code to the core variables reduced these respective rates to 50% and 19%.

Note that the lists of core variables that have acceptable percentages of completeness would not produce very meaningful

multivariate analyses. When even one variable is added to these lists, the percentages drop to unacceptable levels. The ramifications of these observations will be discussed below.

**What Was Learned**

One of the first lessons learned from the project dealt with the sampling of the three groups, i.e., regular-donors, large-donors, and non-donors. It was originally proposed that participating institutions draw their own samples from each of these donor classes based on criteria supplied by the University of Arizona Center. This procedure did not work out well, for a number of reasons, and may have discouraged several of the smaller institutions from participating in the project. As a result, the sampling procedure was changed relatively early in the project. In its revised form, institutions were asked to follow one of two alternate procedures. In the first of these, an institution was asked to supply the Center with the requested variables for all individuals in their file and the Center would draw the samples from the file supplied. The alternate procedure was to supply only the identification numbers of individuals in each of the donor groups: the Center would sample these three groups of identification numbers and return these sets of numbers to the institution which would then supply the Center with data on those selected individuals. Of those institutions supplying data only one did its own sampling; of the others, one used a

sampling scheme designed specifically to overcome a data processing problem, four supplied their entire file for the Center to sample, and two supplied data based on Center drawn samples from identification number files.

Another problem is the cost to an institution of supplying data for inclusion in the CASE donor data base. This cost may have been a factor in the decision of several institutions not to participate in the project. One institution, which is billed separately for computer programming cost and for each data processing run, estimated that it would cost more than $2,000 to supply data for the project. Given the tight budgets of most college or university development offices, the cost of supplying data for the project may be prohibitive. For those development offices with their own data processing staff, these costs are measured in terms of foregone opportunities to work on other software development projects. The costs of participation in the project, however measured, are substantial and those institutions that did participate must be commended for doing so.

There is also a problem with the sample of institutions participating in the project. Based on the most recent Carnegie classification of the eight participating institutions, five are research universities and three are doctoral granting universities. Although the geographical distribution seems reasonable, the sample is biased toward the largest and most prestigious institutions. In order to obtain a sample that is representative, the sampling frame needs to be expanded to

include other types of institutions, e.g., comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, and two year colleges. Getting the cooperation of institutions of these types will probably require some financial incentive; the data processing staff at these institutions are likely to be small, perhaps only one person, and are likely to be completely committed to routine day-to-day activities.

Another lesson learned is that files maintained for one purpose are not easily adaptable for another purpose. In this case the development data bases maintained by institutions do a good job of keeping track of alumni and donor addresses and alumni graduation dates; they also do a good job of maintaining giving records. Both of these are obviously necessary if a development office is to perform its functions in an efficient and effective manner. However, other data items, e.g., date of birth, gender and other personal variables seem to be kept in a haphazard manner. In some cases the lack of these data items is understandable; a development office would not want to press non-alumni individuals too hard for these data for fear of alienating donors. On the other hand, for alumni, these data should be available in a student's record and not transferring these data to an individual's record in the development file is an oversight. Whatever the reason for the lack of these demographic data items in the files examined thus far, the high percentage of missing values for key variables negatively impacts the use of the CASE donor data base for research purposes.

It seems clear that the high percentage of missing values for key demographic variables, especially in a multivariate context, severely limits the usefulness of the data base. In an attempt to overcome this limitation, the Center developed a questionnaire designed to capture key demographic and other data items necessary for a rich and complete donor data base for research purposes. A preliminary version of the questionnaire was circulated among a number of individuals and their comments were incorporated in a draft questionnaire (see Appendix F). The draft was then sent to all members of the CASE Research Committee and the comments and suggestions of these individuals were solicited.

A number of individuals were contacted, mostly in an informal manner, and asked if their institution would be willing to use the questionnaire to survey a couple of their donors and non-donors. For a variety of reasons, none of the institutions contacted was willing to sponsor such a survey.

Another shortcoming of the donor data base is the period of time for which giving data are available for the various institutions on the data base. It was originally planned to include giving data for the most recent five years for each institution on the data base. However, some of the institutions supplied their data in late 1987 while the rest supplied their data at various times in early 1988. Thus, for some institutions the data base contains a partial year's data for 1987 and the rest contain a partial year's data for 1988. To further

complicate this problem, one of the institutions keeps yearly giving totals for the most recent two years plus the current year. As a result of this state of affairs, the intersection of all of the institution's yearly giving totals contains only the giving totals for the year 1986; stated another way, 1986 is the only year for which giving totals are available for all the institutions on the data base. A related problem involves the comparability of the total giving amounts in each individual's record on the data base. The number of years for which these totals have been accumulated varies from one institution to another with no two institutions having accumulated these totals for the same number of years. Thus, this data item in the data base is of limited use and certainly cannot be used for comparative purposes. Another limitation of the giving data on the data base is that gifts-in-kind are identified separately by some of the institutions and are not so identified by others. This could cause comparability problems with respect to total giving by individuals.

There seems to be a rather small number of large donors on the computerized files supplied by the various institutions participating in the donor data base project. This may indicate that the giving records of this type of donor are kept on files, either computerized or hand written, that are separate from the files from which the records supplied to the Center were extracted. If this is the case, any inferences drawn from the results of statistical analyses would be erroneous, even if the

sample of institutions was acceptable.

Another source of error in giving estimates may be due to the extent to which the donations of individuals to various subunits of the university, i. e., colleges, departments, etc., are included in the giving records supplied the Center. If donations to some of these units are not processed by the development office, the giving amounts recorded in the donor data base will obviously be in error.

## Analysis of Giving Data

An examination of the table entitled Variables in Institutional Files in Appendix A shows that there are few variables that are common to all the institutions participating in the study. One class of variables that was supplied by all institutions were those relating to individual giving. However a close examination of the years for which the data are available for each institution shows that 1986 is the only year in which giving data are available for all institutions. One reason for this state of affairs relates to the year in which data were supplied to the Center for processing. Two of the institutions supplied data in late 1987 and thus supplied only partial giving data for that year. Institution F supplied data in 1989 and its data includes only partial giving histories for donors on its file for that year. Institution C

supplied giving history data for the years 1986 to 1988; this institution only keeps yearly donor totals for the most recent two years plus the current year's total. Thus the analysis of giving across all institutions was essentially limited by the data available from Institution C. Since only three institutions supplied data on gifts-in-kind, analysis of separate giving funds was not performed and the analysis was restricted to analysis of total contributions. Preliminary results from the processing of institutional data show several interesting patterns. The reader is cautioned that the results reported below are not based a random sample of institutions and, thus, may not be representative of donor behavior in general.

**Large Donors**

Only four of the seven institutions provided giving data on donors in the Large Donor category. Of these four, three were independent (IA, IB, and IE) and one was public (IG). The average total contributions for 1986 was $135,259; note that the magnitude of this result is largely attributable to one institution having 131 donors in this category averaging $223,374 per donor (see Appendix G, Table 1). In contrast, the other two independent institutions had more modest averages of $45,443 and $71,727, respectively. The lone public institution is easy to identify as it only averaged $2,013 per donor. One

would expect this pattern since the independent institutions rely more heavily on donations to meet current expenditures and usually work harder at fund raising than do the public institutions which have their current expenditures largely funded from state appropriations.

Male donors in this category gave nearly twice as much, on average, as females in this year ($51,329 to $24,582). However, for Institution A, females gave more than males ($45,722 to $44,938). The large number of donors with missing values for the gender variable makes conclusions in this regard speculative at best.

An examination of giving by decade of graduation for all institutions combined seems to show a life cycle pattern of giving. Individuals well past retirement age (those having graduated in the 1920s or 1930s) donate larger amounts, on average, than those just about to retire or in their early retirement years (those having graduated in the 1940s). Those who graduated in the 1950s and at the peak of their earning power tend to give more than those graduating in the immediately preceding decade. Average giving for those graduating in more recent decades drops off from the relative peak attained by those graduating in the 1950s. Again, the large number of individuals with missing values for decade of graduation makes any conclusions regarding these results speculative.

**Regular Donors**

Average giving per donor for all institutions was $285 in 1986 with institutional averages in this regard ranging from $13 to $814 (see Appendix G, Table 2). It is relatively easy to identify the public institutions in the study as they all have two digit averages as compared to the three digit averages of the independents. As was the case with the large donors, male donors in the regular donor category gave more ($309), on average, than females ($192). Note that the differential here was approximately 3 to 2 as compared to the 2 to 1 differential shown for the large donors. As before, missing values undoubtedly impact these results.

When average giving by decade of graduation is examined for 1986, a much more clear-cut pattern emerges for this category of donor than that shown for large donors. Average giving per donor for 1986 for the regular donors increases almost steadily from $52 per 1980s graduate to $849 per graduate in the 1930s and then decreases slightly to $668 per graduate in the 1920s. Missing values create a problem for this analysis but are not quite as severe a problem here as they were for the other analyses discussed above.

**Non-Donors**

Non-donor demographics are shown in Table 3 in Appendix G.

Note that approximately 4% of the individual records have missing values for the gender variable across all institutions. One institution did not supply values for gender. This percentage is low when compared with the 27% missing values for gender in the regular donor files and 29% missing in the large donor files.

Approximately 11% of the non-donor records have missing values for the decade of graduation variable for all institutions. The regular donor and large donor files have 26% and 62%, respectively, missing values for this variable.

**Conclusions/Implications**

Despite the problems missing values present for multivariate analyses, the CASE Donor Data Base can be of value for a number of useful research studies. First, the data base is the only extant source of donor data with a nationwide scope. This will allow "first cut" national donor profiles to be constructed and analyzed. Second, data are available for all large donors at a number of institutions. Aggregations of these data will allow preliminary profiles of this category of donor to be constructed and analyzed. Third, data on graduation date and field of study are generally good for relatively recent graduates. Profiles of the giving behavior of graduates over the last 7 to 10 years would provide information on this group of individuals that is not available from any other source.

Fourth, data on the dollar value of gifts-in-kind donations is available for three of the institutions participating in the project. These data should allow preliminary analyses of the types of individuals making this category of donation and the magnitude of this type of giving. Fifth, a study of the giving behavior of donors/alumni in the institution's home state can be compared with that of similar individuals residing in surrounding states or residing in states more remote than the surrounding states. Sixth, it is possible to compare the magnitude of giving for individuals receiving the bachelor's degree with individuals receiving professional or other advanced degrees. Of special interest in this regard would be comparison of the magnitude of giving for individuals receiving law or medical degrees with that of individuals receiving other advanced degrees. Thus, while the results of the studies suggested above could be generalized only to a limited population of institutions, these studies would show the usefulness of a national donor data base and possibly lead to funding of a project designed to capture a more complete set of donor data than can be gathered directly from institutional files.

[EOD]

# APPENDIX A

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Variables in Institutional Files

| VARIABLE NAME | INSTITUTION A | INSTITUTION B | INSTITUTION C | INSTITUTION D | INSTITUTION E | INSTITUTION F | INSTITUTION G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UNIVERSITY-CODE | 006 | 003 | 004 | 012 | 011 | 002 | 013 |
| SSN-ID | ID | ID | ID | ID | ID | SSN | ID |
| STATE-COUNTRY | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| ZIPCODE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| TELE-AREA-CODE | NO | YES | NO | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| TITLE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| GENDER | YES | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| ETHNICITY | NO | NO | YES | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| BIRTHDATE | NO | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| BIRTH-MONTH | NO | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| BIRTH-DAY | NO | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| BIRTH-YEAR | NO | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| MARITAL-STATUS | NO | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO |
| ATHLETICS-PARTIC | NO | NO | YES | YES | NO | NO | YES |
| NUMBER-CHILDREN | NO | YES | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| FRAT-SORIT-FLAG | NO | YES | YES | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| FRAT-SORIT-MEMBER | NO | YES | YES | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| PROF-CODE | NO | YES | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| POSIT-TITL-CODE | NO | YES | YES | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| SALARY-CODE | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| DEATH-DATE-FLAG | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| DEATH-DATE | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| DEATH-DATE-MONTH | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| DEATH-DATE-DAY | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| DEATH-DATE-YEAR | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| SPOUSE-ID-CODE | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| SPOUSE-ALUM-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| DONOR-TYPE | NO | NO | NO | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| DONOR-CODE-CAT | NO | NO | NO | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| GIVING-CLUB-MEMBER | YES | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES |
| SOLICIT-CODE | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| DEFERRED-GIVING-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| DEFERRED-GIVING | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |

Variables in Institutional Files (Cont.)

| VARIABLE NAME | INSTITUTION A | INSTITUTION B | INSTITUTION C | INSTITUTION D | INSTITUTION E | INSTITUTION F | INSTITUTION G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACADEMIC-AWARDS | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| STUDENT-ACTIVITIES | NO | NO | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| HONORS-STUDENT | NO | NO | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| TRUSTEE-STATUS-FLAG | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| TRUSTEE-STATUS | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | YES |
| ALUMNI-ASSN-MEM | NO | YES | NO | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| ALUMNI-TYPE-MEM | NO | YES | NO | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| MATCHED-GIFT | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES |
| MOST-REC-DEG1 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| MOST-REC-DEG1-MAJOR | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| MOST-REC-DEG1-YEAR | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| NEXT-REC-DEG2 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| NEXT-REC-DEG2-MAJOR | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| NEXT-REC-DEG2-YEAR | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES |
| NEXT-REC-DEG3 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | NO |
| NEXT-REC-DEG3-MAJOR | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | NO |
| NEXT-REC-DEG3-YEAR | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | NO |
| SCHOOL-COLLEGE-CODE | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO | NO | YES |
| OTHER-COLLEGE-ATTENDED | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO |
| OTHER-COLLEGE-DEGREE | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |

Variables in Institutional Files (Cont.)

| VARIABLE NAME | INSTITUTION A | INSTITUTION B | INSTITUTION C | INSTITUTION D | INSTITUTION E | INSTITUTION F | INSTITUTION G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANNUAL-FD-POTENTIAL | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| ANNUAL-FD-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ANNUAL-FD-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | 1988 | 1988 | 1988 | 1989 | 1988 |
| ANNUAL-FD-AMT-LST-YR | 1987 | 1987 | 1987 | 1987 | 1987 | 1988 | 1987 |
| ANNUAL-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1987 | 1986 |
| ANNUAL-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | 1985 | 1985 | NO | 1985 | 1985 | 1986 | 1985 |
| ANNUAL-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | 1984 | 1984 | NO | 1984 | 1984 | 1985 | 1984 |
| ANNUAL-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | 1983 | 1983 | NO | NO | NO | 1984 | 1983 |
| ANNUAL-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | YES | NO | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| ANNUAL-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED |
| ANNUAL-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| ANNUAL-FD-PLEDGE-AMT | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
| ANNUAL-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED |
| CAPITAL-FD-POTENTIAL | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | 1989 | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-AMT-LST-YR | NO | 1987 | NO | NO | NO | 1988 | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | NO | 1986 | NO | NO | NO | 1987 | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | NO | 1985 | NO | NO | NO | 1986 | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | NO | 1984 | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | NO | 1983 | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | CALCULATED | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | NO | 5 | NO | NO | NO | 4 | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-PLEDGE-AMT | NO | N.A. | NO | NO | NO | N.A. | NO |
| CAPITAL-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | CALCULATED | NO |

Variables in Institutional Files (Cont.)

| VARIABLE NAME | INSTITUTION A | INSTITUTION B | INSTITUTION C | INSTITUTION D | INSTITUTION E | INSTITUTION F | INSTITUTION G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ATHLETIC-FD-POTENTIAL | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | 1988 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-LST-YR | 1987 | NO | 1987 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | 1986 | NO | 1986 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | 1985 | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | 1984 | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | 1983 | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | CALCULATED | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | 5 | NO | 3 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-PLEDGE-AMT | N.A. | NO | N.A. | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| ATHLETIC-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE | CALCULATED | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-POTENTIAL | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-AMT-LST-YR | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-PLEDGE-AMT | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| MEDICAL-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |

Variables in Institutional Files (Cont.)

| VARIABLE NAME | INSTITUTION A | INSTITUTION B | INSTITUTION C | INSTITUTION D | INSTITUTION E | INSTITUTION F | INSTITUTION G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SPEC-1-FD-POTENTIAL | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | 1988 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-AMT-LST-YR | NO | NO | 1987 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | 1986 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | NO | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | NO | NO | 3 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-PLEDGE-AMT | NO | NO | N.A. | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-1-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE | NO | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-POTENTIAL | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | 1988 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-AMT-LST-YR | NO | NO | 1987 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | 1986 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | NO | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | NO | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | NO | NO | 3 | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-PLEDGE-AMT | NO | NO | N.A. | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| SPEC-2-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE | NO | NO | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | NO |

Variables in Institutional Files (Cont.)

| VARIABLE NAME | INSTITUTION A | INSTITUTION B | INSTITUTION C | INSTITUTION D | INSTITUTION E | INSTITUTION F | INSTITUTION G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GIFT-INKIND-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | NO | NO | 1988 | 1989 | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-AMT-LST-YR | 1987 | NO | NO | NO | 1987 | 1988 | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | 1986 | NO | NO | NO | 1986 | 1987 | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | 1985 | NO | NO | NO | 1985 | 1986 | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | 1984 | NO | NO | NO | 1984 | NO | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | 1983 | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | 5 | NO | NO | NO | 5 | 4 | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-PLEDGE-AMT | N.A. | NO | NO | NO | N.A. | N.A. | NO |
| GIFT-INKIND-LST-GIFT-DATE | CALCULATED | NO | NO | NO | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | NO |
| | | | | | | | |
| TOT-CONTRIB-FLAG | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-CUR-YR | NO | NO | 1988 | 1988 | 1988 | 1989 | 1988 |
| TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-LST-YR | 1987 | 1987 | 1987 | 1987 | 1987 | 1988 | 1987 |
| TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-2-YRS-AGO | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1987 | 1986 |
| TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-3-YRS-AGO | 1985 | 1985 | NO | 1985 | 1985 | 1986 | 1985 |
| TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-4-YRS-AGO | 1984 | 1984 | NO | 1984 | 1984 | 1985 | 1984 |
| TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-5-YRS-AGO | 1983 | 1983 | NO | NO | NO | 1984 | 1983 |
| TOT-CONTRIB-TOTAL-ALL-YRS | YES | NO | YES | YES | NO | YES | YES |
| TOT-CONTRIB-TOTAL-N-P-YRS | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED |
| TOT-CONTRIB-N-PREV-YRS-EQ | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| TOT-CONTRIB-PLEDGE-AMT | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
| TOT-CONTRIB-LST-GIFT-DATE | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED |
| | | | | | | | |
| TYPE-GIFTS-IN-KIND-RECENT | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
| TOT-PLDGE-AMT-ALL-CURRENT | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
| CONSECUTIVE-YRS-GIVING | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED | CALCULATED |

Compiled and calculated by The Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

# APPENDIX B

Software Vendors Sending Materials
in Response to the Letter of Inquiry

1. American Management Systems, Inc.
2. APT Computer Solutions, Inc.
3. Blackbaud Microsystems, Inc.
4. Business Systems Resouces, Inc. (BSR)
5. The Camis Co., Inc.
6. CARS Information Systems Corp.
7. Computer Management and Development Services, Inc.
8. Development Strategies, Inc.
9. FRA, Inc.
10. Information Associates
11. Karico Systems, Inc.
12. Master Software Corp.
13. McDonnell Douglas Computer Systems Co.
14. The POISE Co., Inc.
15. Quodata Corp.
16. Western American Computing Corp.
17. The Williamson Group
18. Zoller Data Systems

# APPENDIX C

Institutions Expressing an Interest in CASE Donor Data Base Project But Not Yet Participating

1. Case Western University
2. Ohio State University
3. Kalamazoo College
4. University of Santa Clara
5. University of Maryland
6. Columbia University
7. University of Michigan
8. University of Rochester
9. University of San Diego
10. Drew University
11. University of New Mexico

# APPENDIX D

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages for Key Variables
Institution A

| | Regular Donors | Large Donors | Non Donors |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Records | 500 | 65 | 500 |

| Variable Name | Percent Missing | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Zipcode | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gender | 12 | 11 | 15 |
| Ethnicity | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Birthdate | N/A | N/A | 69 |
| Marital Status | N/A | N/A | 46 |
| Position Title Code | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Salary Code | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Deferred Giving | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Most Recent Degree1 | 39 | 60 | N/A |
| Most Recent Degree1-Major | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Most Recent Degree1-Year | 33 | 45 | 42 |
| Next Most Recent Degree2 | 92 | 97 | N/A |
| Next Recent Degree2-Major | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Next Recent Degree2-Year | 92 | 95 | N/A |
| Next Most Recent Degree3 | 99 | 100 | N/A |
| Next Recent Degree3-Major | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Next Recent Degree3-Year | 99.6 | 100 | N/A |

Note: N/A indicates data item not available or not supplied.

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages for Key Variables
Institution B

| | Regular Donors | Large Donors | Non Donors |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Records | 478 | 0 | 0 |

| Variable Name | Percent Missing |
|---|---|
| Zipcode | .8 |
| Gender | N/A |
| Ethnicity | N/A |
| Birthdate | N/A |
| Marital Status | N/A |
| Position Title Code | 40 |
| Salary Code | N/A |
| Deferred Giving | N/A |
| Most Recent Degree1 | 3 |
| Most Recent Degree1-Major | 62 |
| Most Recent Degree1-Year | 3 |
| Next Most Recent Degree2 | 89 |
| Next Recent Degree2-Major | 94 |
| Next Recent Degree2-Year | 89 |
| Next Most Recent Degree3 | 99 |
| Next Recent Degree3-Major | 99 |
| Next Recent Degree3-Year | 99 |

Note: N/A indicates data not available or not supplied.

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages
Institution C

| | Regular Donors | Large Donors | Non Donors |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Records | 500 | 0 | 1102 |

| Variable Name | Percent Missing | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Zipcode | .2 | N/A | 2 |
| Gender | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Ethnicity | 95 | N/A | 95 |
| Birthdate | 9 | N/A | 11 |
| Marital Status | 7 | N/A | 17 |
| Position Title Code | 46 | N/A | 79 |
| Salary Code | 75 | N/A | 94 |
| Deferred Giving | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Most Recent Degree1 | .6 | N/A | .2 |
| Most Recent Degree1-Major | 28 | N/A | 28 |
| Most Recent Degree1-Year | 3 | N/A | 5 |
| Next Most Recent Degree2 | 85 | N/A | 85 |
| Next Recent Degree2-Major | 87 | N/A | 85 |
| Next Recent Degree2-Year | 84 | N/A | 84 |
| Next Most Recent Degree3 | 98 | N/A | 99 |
| Next Recent Degree3-Major | 98 | N/A | 99 |
| Next Recent Degree3-Year | 98 | N/A | 99 |

Note: N/A indicates data item not available or not supplied.

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages for Key Variables
Institution E

| | Regular Donors | Large Donors | Non Donors |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Records | 548 | 131 | 495 |

| Variable Name | Percent Missing | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Zipcode | 5 | 31 | 21 |
| Gender | 14 | 44 | 1 |
| Ethnicity | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Birthdate | 98 | 63 | 99 |
| Marital Status | 88 | 49 | 99 |
| Position Title Code | 21 | 58 | 23 |
| Salary Code | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Deferred Giving | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Most Recent Degree1 | 20 | 73 | 0 |
| Most Recent Degree1-Major | 20 | 73 | 0 |
| Most Recent Degree1-Year | 21 | 75 | 1 |
| Next Most Recent Degree2 | 84 | 89 | 87 |
| Next Recent Degree2-Major | 84 | 89 | 87 |
| Next Recent Degree2-Year | 84 | 89 | 87 |
| Next Most Recent Degree3 | 98 | 97 | 99 |
| Next Recent Degree3-Major | 98 | 97 | 99 |
| Next Recent Degree3-Year | 98 | 97 | 99 |

Note: N/A indicates data item not available.

# APPENDIX E

**CASE Donor Data Base Project**
Percentage of Records Containing Valid
Values for Combinations of Variables

| Institution/File | Percentage of Records | Variable List |
|---|---|---|
| Tufts University | | |
| Regular Donors | 59.4 | Zipcode, Most Recent Degree Year, Position Title Code |
| Texas Christian University | | |
| Regular Donors | 66.4 | Zipcode, Gender, Most Recent Degree Year |
| Large Donors | 55.4 | Zipcode, Gender, Most Recent Degree Year |
| Non-Donors | 23.8 | Zipcode, Gender, Most Recent Degree Year, Birthdate, Marital Status |
| California Institute of Technology | | |
| Regular Donors (1) | 72.1 | Zipcode, Gender, Position Title Code, Most Recent Degree Year |
| Regular Donors (2) | 6.2 | Zipcode, Gender, Position Title Code, Most Recent Degree Year, Marital Status |
| Large Donors (1) | 25.2 | Same variables as Regular Donors (1) |
| Large Donors (2) | 19.8 | Same variables as Regular Donors (2) |
| Non-Donors | 59.0 | Same as Regular Donors (1) |
| University of Arizona | | |
| Regular Donors (3) | 83.8 | Zipcode, Gender, Birthdate, Marital Status, Most Recent Degree Year. |
| Regular Donors (4) | 50.4 | Same variables as Regular Donors (3) plus Position Title Code |
| Non-Donors (1) | 76.6 | Same variables as Regular Donors (3) |
| Non-Donors (2) | 18.7 | Same variables as Regular Donors (4) |

# APPENDIX F

# The CU Study to Enhance Fund-Raising Effectiveness
# Office of University Relations and Development
# College University

**Information given will be for statistical purpses only.**
**The confidence of the respondent will be respected.**

## DIRECTIONS

**Your responses will be read by an optical mark reader. Your careful observance of these few simple rules will be most appreciated.**

- Use only black lead pencil (No. 2 is ideal)
- Make heavy black circles around your answers
- Erase cleanly any answer your wish to change.

PLEASE PRINT (one letter or number per space)

Birth Year __ __

ZIP Code __ __ __ __ __

Phone __ __ __ - __ __ __ - __ __ __ __

**Social Security Number**: (Circle the appropriate numbers)

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

**While you were at the College**: (Note: Circle only one response per column.)

1. **Degree(s) earned**:

| | 1st Degree | 2nd Degree | 3rd Degree |
|---|---|---|---|
| None | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Bachelors | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Masters | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Doctorate | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 3 |

2. Below is a list of different major fields grouped into general categories. Circle only one answer to indicate your field of study for each degree earned at the college.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ARTS AND HUMANITIES** | | | |
| Art, fine and applied | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| English (language and literature | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| History | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Journalism | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Language and Literature (except English) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Music | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Philosophy | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Speech | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Theater or Drama | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Theology or Religion | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Arts and Humanities | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE** | | | |
| Biology (general) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Biochemistry or Biophysics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Botany | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Marine (Life) Science | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Microbiology or Bacteriology | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Zoology | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Biological Science | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **BUSINESS** | | | |
| Accounting | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Business Admin. (general) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Finance | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Marketing | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Management | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Secretarial Studies | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Business | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **EDUCATION** | | | |
| Business Education | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Elementary Education | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Music or Art Education | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Physical Education or Recreation | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Secondary Education | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Special Education | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Education | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **ENGINEERING** | | | |
| Aeronautical or Astronautical Eng. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Civil Engineering | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Chemical Engineering | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Electrical or Electronic Engineering | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Industrial Engineering | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Mechanical Engineering | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Engineering | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Law | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Medicine | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Dentistry | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Pharmacy | 1 | 2 | 3 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **PHYSICAL SCIENCE** | | | |
| Astronomy | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Atmospheric Science (incl. Meteorology) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Chemistry | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Earth Science | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Marine Science (incl. Oceanography) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Mathematics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Physics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Statistics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Physical Science | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **PROFESSIONAL** | | | |
| Architecture or Urban Planning | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Home Economics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Health Technology (medical, dental, laboratory) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Library or Archival Science | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Nursing | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Pharmacy | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Predental, Premedicine, Preveterinary | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Therapy (occupational, physical, speech) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other professional | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **SOCIAL SCIENCE** | | | |
| Anthropology | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Economics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Ethnic Studies | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Geography | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Political Science (gov't., international relations) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Psychology | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Social Work | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Sociology | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Women's Studies | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Social Science | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **TECHNICAL** | | | |
| Building Trades | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Data Processing or Computer Programming | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Drafting or Design | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Electronics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Mechanics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other Technical | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **OTHER FIELDS** | | | |
| Agriculture | 1 | 2 | |
| Communications (radio, TV, etc) | 1 | 2 | |
| Computer Science | 1 | 2 | |
| Forestry | 1 | 2 | |
| Law Enforcement | 1 | 2 | |
| Military Science | 1 | 2 | |
| Other field | 1 | 2 | |
| Undecided | 1 | 2 | |

3. **Year of Degree**:
(circle the appropriate numbers)

| 1st Degree | 2nd Degree | 3rd Degree |
|---|---|---|
| 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 |
| 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 |
| 2 2 | 2 2 | 2 2 |
| 3 3 | 3 3 | 3 3 |
| 4 4 | 4 4 | 4 4 |
| 5 5 | 5 5 | 5 5 |
| 6 6 | 6 6 | 6 6 |
| 7 7 | 7 7 | 7 7 |
| 8 8 | 8 8 | 8 8 |
| 9 9 | 9 9 | 9 9 |

**Which of the following best describes your**:
(Mark only one circle for each question)

| | Most Pleasant | | Unpleasant | Most Pleasant |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. **overall experience at the College?** | O | O | O | O |
| 5. **academic experience?** | O | O | O | O |
| 6. **personal/social life experience?** | O | O | O | O |
| 7. **experience with college teachers?** | O | O | O | O |

8. **What was your primary residence while at the College?** (Mark only one)

| | |
|---|---|
| Dorm | O |
| Fraternity/Sorority | O |
| Other Campus Housing | O |
| With Family/Relations | O |
| Other | O |

9. **Were you primarily a**:

| | |
|---|---|
| Full-time student | O |
| Part-time student | O |

10. **What was your undergraduate college grade average?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| D O | C- O | B- O | A- O |
| D+ O | C O | B O | A O |
| | C+ O | B+ O | |

11. **What was your high school grade average?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| D O | C- O | B- O | A- O |
| D+ O | C O | B O | A O |
| | C+ O | B+ O | |

12. **Were you**: (Mark all that apply)

| | |
|---|---|
| a fraternity/sorority member? | O |
| active in student activities? | O |
| involved in inter-collegiate activities? | O |
| an honors student? | O |
| a recipient of other college awards? | O |
| a recipient of a college scholarship? | O |
| Academic | O |
| Athletic | O |
| Other | O |
| a recipient of other student aid? | O |
| Grant | O |
| Loan | O |
| Other | O |

**In your opinion**: (Circle only one number)

13. **The College does a good job of producing a well-rounded student, one whose physical, social, and intellectual potentials are cultivated.**

| Strongly Agree | Agree | No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

14. **The College does a good job of preparing students for useful careers.**

| Strongly Agree | Agree | No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

15. **The college does a good job at assisting students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence to examine those beliefs critically.**

| Strongly Agree | Agree | No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**At the time you entered the College.**

16. **How many miles was it to your permanent home?**

| | |
|---|---|
| 5 or less | O |
| 6 - 50 | O |
| 51 - 100 | O |
| 101 - 500 | O |
| over 500 | O |

**Regarding other colleges you may have attended:**

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 17. **Have you attended another college?** | O | O |
| 18. **Have you earned a degree from another college?** | O | O |
| a. **Was this degree earned later?** | O | O |
| 19. **Do you contribute to that college?** | O | O |

**Regarding your personal characteristics:**

20. **Your sex:** Male O Female O

21. **Marital status:** (Mark one or two responses)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Married | O | Single | O |
| Widowed | O | Divorced | O |

22. **Ethnicity:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Caucasian | O | Black | O |
| Hispanic | O | Other | O |

23. **How many children do you have?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Zero | O | 3 - 4 | O |
| 1 - 2 | O | 5 or more | O |

a. **Are any of these children or your spouse presently enrolled at the College?**

Yes O No O

b. **Has a child been enrolled at the College in the past?**

Yes O No O

24. **If you are married or widowed, is/or was your spouse an alumnus of the College?**

Yes O No O

25. **Mark at most three responses, one each column:**

NOTE: If your spouse is deceased, please indicate his or her last occupation.

D Deceased Spouse Occupation
S Spouse's Occupation
Y Your Occupation

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accountant or actuary | Y | S | D | Military service (career) | Y | S | D |
| Actor or entertainer | Y | S | D | Musician (performer, composer) | Y | S | D |
| Architect or urban planner | Y | S | D | Nurse | Y | S | D |
| Artist | Y | S | D | Optometrist | Y | S | D |
| Business (clerical) | Y | S | D | Pharmacist | Y | S | D |
| Business executive (management, administrator) | Y | S | D | Physician | Y | S | D |
| Business owner or proprietor | Y | S | D | School counselor | Y | S | D |
| Business salesperson or buyer | Y | S | D | School principal or superintendent | Y | S | D |
| Clergyman (minister, priest) | Y | S | D | Scientific researcher | Y | S | D |
| Clergy (other religious) | Y | S | D | Social, welfare or recreation worker | Y | S | D |
| Clinical psychologist | Y | S | D | Statistician | Y | S | D |
| College teacher | Y | S | D | Therapist (physical, occupational, speech) | Y | S | D |
| Computer programmer or analyst | Y | S | D | Teacher or administrator (elementary) | Y | S | D |
| Conservationist or forester | Y | S | D | Teacher or administrator (secondary) | Y | S | D |
| Dentist (including orthodontist) | Y | S | D | Veterinarian | Y | S | D |
| Dietician or home economist | Y | S | D | Writer or journalist | Y | S | D |
| Engineer | Y | S | D | Skilled trades | Y | S | D |
| Farmer or rancher | Y | S | D | Other | Y | S | D |
| Foreign service worker (including diplomat) | Y | S | D | Undecided | Y | S | D |
| Homemaker | Y | S | D | Laborer (unskilled) | Y | S | D |
| Interior decorator (including designer) | Y | S | D | Semi-skilled worker | Y | S | D |
| Interpreter (translator) | Y | S | D | Other occupation | Y | S | D |
| Lab technician or hygienist | Y | S | D | Unemployed | Y | S | D |
| Law enforcement officer | Y | S | D | | | | |
| Lawyer (attorney) or judge | Y | S | D | | | | |

26. **Your annual salary/earnings**
$_____

**Spouse's annual salary/earnings**
$_____

(Note: Income is salary/earnings plus other income.)

**Your annual income**
$_____

**Spouse's annual income**
$_____

27. **Are you responding to this questionnaire as a**

| | |
|---|---|
| Private individual | O |
| Corporation | O |

28. **Which of the following best describes the economic condition of the county of your residence?**

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Presently | O | O | O | O |
| b. 2 - 5 years ago | O | O | O | O |
| c. Expected, 2 - 5 years ahead | O | O | O | O |

29. **Are you or have you been an employee of the College while you were a student?**

Yes O No O

**While not a student**

Yes O No O

30. **Are the contributions you make to the College your own? or**

Yes O No O

**Joint with spouse**

Yes O No O

31. **How many miles is it from your present home to the College?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 or less | O | 101 - 500 | O |
| 6 - 50 | O | over 500 | O |
| 51 - 100 | O | | |

**Regarding your donor behavior to the College:**

32. **What is the principal means by which the College contacts you to solicit financial support?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Phone | O | Letter | O |
| Visit | O | Other | O |

33. **What is the most effective means for a college to contact you for this support?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Phone | O | Letter | O |
| Visit | O | Other | O |

34. **What is your perception of the college's financial need?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Unaware | O | Substantial | O |
| None | O | Critical | O |
| Modest | O | | |

**Regarding your relationship with the College since graduation:**

35. **Have you**

a. **been an alumni association member?**

Yes O No O

b. **been a member of a "giving club"?**

Yes O No O

c. **been awarded an honorary degree?**

Yes O No O

d. **been honored in some other way?**

Yes O No O

e. **been actively involved in some other way?**

Yes O No O

f. **been a trustee?**

Yes O No O

**General**

36. **What factor(s) do you consider to be the most important in explaining your support for the College?**

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

37. **Other comments:**

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please fold the questionnaire so that the return address appears on the outside and place in the mail. Thank you!

# APPENDIX G

Table 1

C A S E -- DATA BASE PRELIMINARY RESULTS
AVERAGE GIFT per LARGE DONOR -- 1986

| | INSTITUTION A | | INSTITUTION B | | INSTITUTION C | | INSTITUTION D | | INSTITUTION E | | INSTITUTION F | | INSTITUTION G | | INSTITUTION ALL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N |
| **TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS - 1986** | $45,443 | 65 | | | | | $71,927 | 8 | $223,374 | 131 | $0 | 2 | $2,013 | 36 | $135,259 | 242 |
| **GIVING BY GENDER:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MISSING VALUES | $47,614 | 7 | | | | | $149,024 | 3 | $419,644 | 58 | $0 | 2 | | | $358,853 | 70 |
| MALE | $44,938 | 40 | | | | | $32,626 | 2 | $78,647 | 59 | | | $2,487 | 27 | $51,329 | 128 |
| FEMALE | $45,722 | 18 | | | | | $21,031 | 3 | $7,480 | 9 | | | $589 | 9 | $24,582 | 39 |
| OTHER | | | | | | | | | $16,830 | 5 | | | | | $16,830 | 5 |
| **GIVING BY DECADE OF GRADUATION** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1900 - 1909 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1910 - 1919 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1920 - 1929 | $14,631 | 4 | | | | | | | $419,015 | 3 | | | $2,750 | 4 | $120,597 | 11 |
| 1930 - 1939 | $117,600 | 5 | | | | | | | $31,745 | 13 | | | $938 | 4 | $45,656 | 22 |
| 1940 - 1949 | $15,068 | 9 | | | | | | | $12,390 | 8 | | | $1,327 | 6 | $10,552 | 23 |
| 1950 - 1959 | $67,743 | 9 | | | | | | | $61,872 | 7 | | | $1,839 | 4 | $52,507 | 20 |
| 1960 - 1969 | $55,100 | 1 | | | | | $4,519 | 1 | | | | | $4,210 | 4 | $9,557 | 8 |
| 1970 - 1979 | $17,665 | 7 | | | | | $33,143 | 1 | $0 | 2 | | | | | $19,600 | 8 |
| 1980 - 1989 | $12,500 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $12,500 | 1 |
| MISSING VALUES | $47,266 | 29 | | | | | $89,626 | 6 | $274,786 | 98 | $0 | 2 | $1,825 | 14 | $193,712 | 149 |
| **GIVING BY DECADE OF BIRTH YEAR** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1900 - 1909 | | | | | | | | | $171,629 | 10 | | | $3,333 | 3 | $132,791 | 13 |
| 1910 - 1919 | | | | | | | | | $54,050 | 21 | | | $2,199 | 8 | $39,746 | 29 |
| 1920 - 1929 | | | | | | | | | $88,226 | 8 | | | $692 | 5 | $54,559 | 13 |
| 1930 - 1939 | | | | | | | | | $700 | 5 | | | $3,714 | 4 | $2,039 | 9 |
| 1940 - 1949 | | | | | | | | | $5,000 | 1 | | | | | $5,000 | 1 |
| 1950 - 1959 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960 - 1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1970 - 1979 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1980 - 1989 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MISSING VALUES | $45,443 | 65 | | | | | $71,927 | 8 | $297,271 | 86 | $0 | 2 | $1,659 | 16 | $164,526 | 177 |





Compiled and calculated by The Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Table 2

C A S E -- DATA BASE PRELIMINARY RESULTS
AVERAGE GIFT per REGULAR DONOR -- 1986

| | INSTITUTION A | | INSTITUTION B | | INSTITUTION C | | INSTITUTION D | | INSTITUTION E | | INSTITUTION F | | INSTITUTION G | | INSTITUTION ALL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N | DOLLARS | N |
| **TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS - 1986** | $814 | 500 | $109 | 478 | $14 | 500 | $307 | 528 | $656 | 548 | $13 | 500 | $35 | 500 | $285 | 3554 |
| **GIVING BY GENDER:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MISSING VALUES | $1,307 | 58 | $109 | 478 | | | $364 | 238 | $661 | 75 | $25 | 95 | | | $283 | 944 |
| MALE | $827 | 260 | | | $17 | 324 | $339 | 198 | $509 | 435 | $15 | 192 | $50 | 298 | $309 | 1707 |
| FEMALE | $639 | 182 | | | $7 | 176 | $91 | 92 | $1,961 | 19 | $5 | 213 | $12 | 185 | $192 | 867 |
| OTHER | | | | | | | | | $2,687 | 19 | | | $13 | 17 | $1,424 | 36 |
| **GIVING BY DECADE OF GRADUATION** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1900 - 1909 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1910 - 1919 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1920 - 1929 | $3,916 | 7 | $208 | 3 | $14 | 7 | | | $170 | 11 | $2 | 8 | $6 | 9 | $668 | 45 |
| 1930 - 1939 | $2,039 | 28 | $294 | 16 | $25 | 23 | $105 | 3 | $1,305 | 47 | $3 | 11 | $38 | 19 | $849 | 147 |
| 1940 - 1949 | $928 | 35 | $437 | 29 | $23 | 39 | $392 | 11 | $1,434 | 80 | $1 | 12 | $17 | 32 | $696 | 238 |
| 1950 - 1959 | $474 | 46 | $169 | 50 | $13 | 71 | $320 | 21 | $175 | 60 | $50 | 25 | $49 | 65 | $156 | 338 |
| 1960 - 1969 | $1,203 | 49 | $151 | 62 | $19 | 113 | $196 | 77 | $222 | 83 | $7 | 72 | $54 | 76 | $204 | 532 |
| 1970 - 1979 | $400 | 86 | $72 | 78 | $10 | 154 | $169 | 159 | $83 | 91 | $9 | 160 | $28 | 103 | $97 | 831 |
| 1980 - 1989 | $69 | 82 | $85 | 104 | $9 | 76 | $1,257 | 7 | $16 | 60 | $4 | 109 | $6 | 63 | $52 | 501 |
| MISSING VALUES | $1,013 | 167 | $14 | 136 | $2 | 17 | $400 | 250 | $1,242 | 116 | $24 | 103 | $41 | 133 | $459 | 922 |
| **GIVING BY DECADE OF BIRTH YEAR** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1900 - 1909 | | | | | $37 | 21 | | | $2,775 | 4 | $2 | 4 | $22 | 18 | $262 | 47 |
| 1910 - 1919 | | | | | $8 | 32 | $0 | 1 | $6,010 | 2 | $12 | 14 | $31 | 25 | $179 | 74 |
| 1920 - 1929 | | | | | $16 | 47 | $675 | 5 | $10,361 | 3 | $8 | 17 | $20 | 53 | $292 | 125 |
| 1930 - 1939 | | | | | $25 | 88 | $308 | 14 | | | $35 | 42 | $88 | 67 | $66 | 211 |
| 1940 - 1949 | | | | | $11 | 140 | $173 | 58 | | | $8 | 117 | $15 | 88 | $34 | 403 |
| 1950 - 1959 | | | | | $9 | 108 | $57 | 17 | | | $7 | 113 | $26 | 89 | $15 | 327 |
| 1960 - 1969 | | | | | $4 | 19 | | | | | $5 | 41 | $3 | 28 | $4 | 88 |
| 1970 - 1979 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1980 - 1989 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MISSING VALUES | $814 | 500 | $109 | 470 | $6 | 45 | $331 | 433 | $860 | 539 | $17 | 152 | $41 | 132 | $402 | 2279 |

55

56

Compiled and calculated by The Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Table 3

C A S E -- DATA BASE PRELIMINARY RESULTS
NON-DONOR DEMOGRAPHICS
(MISSING VALUES INCLUDED)

| | INSTITUTION A | | INSTITUTION B | | INSTITUTION C | | INSTITUTION D | | INSTITUTION E | | INSTITUTION F | | INSTITUTION G | | INSTITUTION ALL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PERCENT | N | PERCENT | N | PERCENT | N | PERCENT | N | PERCENT | N | PERCENT | N | PERCENT | N | PERCENT | N |
| BY GENDER: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MISSING VALUES | 14.8% | 74 | | | | | .2% | 1 | 1.2% | 6 | 11.8% | 59 | .4% | 2 | 3.9% | 142 |
| MALE | 39.4% | 197 | | | 55.4% | 611 | 66.4% | 332 | 92.9% | 460 | 38.0% | 190 | 55.0% | 275 | 57.4% | 2065 |
| FEMALE | 45.8% | 229 | | | 44.6% | 491 | 33.4% | 167 | 5.9% | 29 | 50.2% | 251 | 44.6% | 223 | 38.6% | 1390 |
| OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BY DECADE OF GRADUATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1900 - 1909 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1910 - 1919 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1920 - 1929 | 1.2% | 6 | | | .4% | 4 | 1.2% | 6 | .8% | 4 | 1.4% | 7 | 1.0% | 5 | .9% | 32 |
| 1930 - 1939 | 2.4% | 12 | | | 1.9% | 21 | 3.2% | 16 | 1.8% | 9 | .8% | 4 | 3.2% | 16 | 2.2% | 78 |
| 1940 - 1949 | 9.0% | 45 | | | 3.0% | 33 | 8.2% | 41 | 11.5% | 57 | 1.2% | 6 | 4.6% | 23 | 5.7% | 205 |
| 1950 - 1959 | 5.8% | 29 | | | 6.6% | 73 | 9.0% | 45 | 9.9% | 49 | 2.2% | 11 | 9.2% | 46 | 7.0% | 253 |
| 1960 - 1969 | 9.8% | 49 | | | 17.0% | 187 | 13.4% | 67 | 15.6% | 77 | 10.2% | 51 | 16.2% | 81 | 14.2% | 512 |
| 1970 - 1979 | 13.4% | 67 | | | 26.0% | 287 | 24.4% | 122 | 23.4% | 116 | 37.0% | 185 | 28.2% | 141 | 25.5% | 918 |
| 1980 - 1989 | 14.8% | 74 | | | 39.2% | 432 | 34.0% | 170 | 35.6% | 176 | 40.2% | 201 | 32.0% | 160 | 33.7% | 1213 |
| MISSING VALUES | 43.6% | 218 | | | 5.9% | 65 | 6.6% | 33 | 1.4% | 7 | 7.0% | 35 | 5.6% | 28 | 10.7% | 386 |
| BY DECADE OF BIRTH YEAR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1900 - 1909 | .4% | 2 | | | 1.1% | 12 | .6% | 3 | | | .4% | 2 | 2.2% | 11 | .8% | 30 |
| 1910 - 1919 | 1.0% | 5 | | | 2.7% | 30 | .6% | 3 | .2% | 1 | .8% | 4 | 4.0% | 20 | 1.8% | 63 |
| 1920 - 1929 | 1.6% | 8 | | | 4.9% | 54 | 3.4% | 17 | | | 2.4% | 12 | 8.0% | 40 | 3.6% | 131 |
| 1930 - 1939 | 3.4% | 17 | | | 7.7% | 85 | 1.4% | 7 | | | 6.8% | 34 | 11.4% | 57 | 5.6% | 200 |
| 1940 - 1949 | 7.6% | 38 | | | 22.9% | 252 | 4.4% | 22 | | | 24.0% | 120 | 20.4% | 102 | 14.8% | 534 |
| 1950 - 1959 | 8.6% | 43 | | | 33.1% | 365 | 15.8% | 79 | | | 32.4% | 162 | 32.2% | 161 | 22.5% | 810 |
| 1960 - 1969 | 8.0% | 40 | | | 15.7% | 173 | 18.0% | 90 | | | 16.4% | 82 | 15.4% | 77 | 12.8% | 462 |
| 1970 - 1979 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1980 - 1989 | | | | | | | .2% | 1 | | | | | | | .0% | 1 |
| MISSING VALUES | 69.4% | 347 | | | 11.9% | 131 | 55.6% | 278 | 99.8% | 494 | 16.8% | 84 | 6.4% | 32 | 38.0% | 1366 |

Compiled and calculated by The Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.